

**BEFORE THE TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY**

**NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE**

**July 17, 2003**

**IN RE:**

**PETITION FOR APPROVAL OF  
AMENDMENT TO INTERCONNECTION  
AGREEMENT BETWEEN BELL SOUTH  
TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. AND  
EXCEL TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.**

**DOCKET NO.  
03-00273**

---

**ORDER APPROVING  
SECOND AMENDMENT TO INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT**

---

This matter came before Chairman Deborah Taylor Tate, Director Pat Miller and Director Sara Kyle of the Tennessee Regulatory Authority (the "Authority" or "TRA"), the voting panel assigned to this docket, at a regularly scheduled Authority Conference held on July 7, 2003, to consider, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252, the Petition for approval of the second amendment to the interconnection agreement negotiated between BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. and Excel Telecommunications, Inc.

The original interconnection agreement and first set of amendments thereto between these parties were filed on December 3, 2002, and were assigned Docket No. 02-01272. They were approved at a regularly scheduled Authority Conference on January 27, 2003. The second amendment, which is the subject of this docket, was filed on April 10, 2003.

Based upon a review of the second amendment, the record in this matter, and the standards for review set forth in 47 U.S.C. § 252, the Directors unanimously granted the Petition and made the following findings and conclusions:

1) The Authority has jurisdiction over public utilities pursuant to Tenn. Code Ann. § 65-4-104.

2) The amendment is in the public interest as it provides consumers with alternative sources of telecommunications services within the service area of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.

3) The amendment is not discriminatory to telecommunications service providers that are not parties thereto.

4) 47 U.S.C. § 252(e)(2)(A) provides that a state commission may reject a negotiated agreement only if it “discriminates against a telecommunications carrier not a party to the agreement” or if the implementation of the agreement “is not consistent with the public interest, convenience or necessity.” Unlike arbitrated agreements, a state commission may not reject a negotiated agreement on the grounds that the agreement fails to meet the requirements of 47 U.S.C. §§ 251 or 252(d).<sup>1</sup> Thus, although the Authority finds that neither ground for rejection of a negotiated agreement exists, this finding should not be construed to mean that the amendment is consistent with §§ 251 or 252(d) or, for that matter, previous Authority decisions.

5) No person or entity has sought to intervene in this docket.


6) The amendment is reviewable by the Authority pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252 and Tenn. Code Ann. § 65-4-104.


---

<sup>1</sup> See 47 U.S.C. § 252(e)(2)(B).

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED THAT:**

The Petition is granted, and the second amendment to the interconnection agreement negotiated between BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. and Excel Telecommunications, Inc. is approved and is subject to the review of the Authority as provided herein.

  
Deborah Taylor Tate, Chairman

  
Pat Miller, Director

  
Sara Kyle, Director